



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

CHARLES RILEY,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:15-02331-MGL
	§	
FIDELITY INFORMATION SERVICES	§	
("FIS"), FNF; LENDER PROCESSING	§	
SERVICES, INC. ("LPS"); LPS DEFAULT	§	
SOLUTIONS, INC. DOCX; FIDELITY	§	
SOUTHERN CORPORATIONS;	§	
CARRINGTON MORTGAGE LOAN	§	
TRUST/SERIES 2007-HE1-ASSET BACKED	§	
PASSED-THROUGH CERTIFICATES/	§	
STANWICH ASSET ACCEPTANCE	§	
COMPANY, LLC; DEUTSCHE BANK	§	
NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY; FLEMING	§	
& WHITT DEFAULT LAW FIRM;	§	
NATIONWIDE INSURANCE; SAFECO	§	
INSURANCE CORPORATION OF	§	
AMERICA; MARTHA FLEMING;	§	
HONORABLE DAVID R. DUNCAN; JOY S.	§	
GOODWIN; RYAN W. HOVIS; BRUCE	§	
ROSE; TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT	§	
CORPORATIONS; and EDDYE LANE,	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court that Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, permanent injunction, and cease and desist (TRO Motion)

be denied. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on August 5, 2015, but Plaintiff failed to file any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that Plaintiff’s TRO Motion is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 17th day of September, 2015, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis

MARY GEIGER LEWIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.